## REMARKS

Entry of the amendment should be allowed since it merely corrects a typographical error.

With respect to the rejection of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the asserted combination of three references is insufficient to meet all the limitations of the claim and a rationale to modify the references is not pointed out. Therefore, a *prima facie* rejection is not set forth.

The claim requires determining whether the task is completed after an estimated time for completion of the task and, if not, determining why the task was not completed.

The office action points out that neither Kraft nor Zack teach this limitation. However, it is contended that this is taught by Doney. However, Doney merely analyzes what went wrong in the very system doing the analysis. In other words, Doney teaches self-analysis. The claim requires analysis of why a different system, separate from the analyzing system, failed to complete a task on time. Doney provides no insight as to how this would be done. No rationale to modify Doney is pointed out in the rejection and, therefore, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out.

As shown in Doney's Figure 1, the system that is being analyzed is also the system doing the analysis. This is a very different situation than trying to analyze what is going on in a separate system and why it failed to perform its task.

Therefore, reconsideration would be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>November 16, 2006</u>

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

6